1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 10 11 ROBERT ANDREW ROSE, 12 Plaintiff(s), Case No. 2:13-cv-00568-GMN-NJK 13 ORDER DENYING PROPOSED vs. DISCOVERY PLAN (Docket No. 23) 14 WASHTRONICS OF AMERICA, et al., 15 Defendant(s). 16 Pending before the Court is the Proposed Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order, Docket No. 17 23, which is hereby **DENIED**. The proposed discovery plan is deficient in a number of respects. 18 First, the Local Rules require proposed discovery plans to "state the date the first defendant 19 answered or otherwise appeared." Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). The submitted discovery plan fails to do 20 so. Second, the presumptive discovery period is 180 days from the date the first defendant answers 21 or appears. Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). The proposed plan seeks additional time for discovery by 22 seeking 270 days from the date of the Rule 26(f) conference, but the parties provide no meaningful 23 explanation why extended discovery is required. See Docket No. 23 at 2 (requesting additional time 24 "[d]ue to the volume of documents," without any elaboration). 25 // 26 // 27 // 28

## Case 2:13-cv-00568-JAD-NJK Document 24 Filed 07/22/13 Page 2 of 2

Accordingly, the proposed discovery plan is **DENIED**. The parties are ordered, no later than July 29, 2013, to file another proposed discovery plan that complies with the Local Rules. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: July 22, 2013 NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge